

**REMARKS**

In the Office action of March 28, 2005, the Examiner cited various combinations of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and/or Ogier in rejecting claims 1-52 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Before addressing the grounds for rejection, the Applicants would like to draw the Examiner's attention to some of the novel and unobvious features of their claimed invention. The Applicants claimed name distribution messages are distributed by the wireless devices in an ad hoc network. The name distribution messages include at least one user-defined name and an operation code that causes the receiving device in the ad hoc network to select an operation relating to a user-defined name that does not conflict with other member device names in the ad hoc network. A comparison is made to automatically resolve any name conflict and a user-defined name that does not conflict is automatically made a part of a user name record in the receiving device. The selected operation specified by the operation code can be, for example, to add a new device, delete a device, change the name of a device, substitute a new name manager table, specify security attributes for distributing the name, specify display attributes for displaying the name, or specify name flash display attributes for remotely flashing the displayed name. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in the Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and/or Ogier references fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature, among other features of the invention.

**Issues Raised by the Examiner:**

**[1] Office Action Section 5, page 2 last paragraph and page 3, first full paragraph:**

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner states that Flanagan does not disclose the Applicants' claimed step of receiving a name distribution message associating a user device address with a user-defined name, but when Flanagan is combined with the Zintel reference, the combination makes the step obvious. The Examiner relies on the broadcast discovery request operation

specifying a desired device type or capability disclosed by Zintel on pages 1-2, paragraphs 0008 to 0012.

The Applicants reply that Zintel discloses in paragraph 0011 that there are two naming techniques. The first technique disclosed by Zintel in paragraph 0011 requires an external name server to assign a name to the introduced device. The second technique used without a name server as disclosed by Zintel in paragraph 0011 requires the introduced device to send out a query to search for the name of another device, no mention being made of any name for the introduced device. In neither case referred to by the Examiner does Zintel disclose the claimed message, itself, associating a user device address with a user-defined name. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Zintel taken alone or in combination with Flanagan does not disclose or suggest the claimed step of receiving a name distribution message associating a user device address with a user-defined name.

**[2] Office Action Section 5, page 3, second last paragraph:** Further with respect to claim 1, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan and Zintel discloses the claimed comparing the user-defined name with the member-defined name (Flanagan abstract and Zintel pages 9-10, paragraph 0159.) As the Examiner observes, Flanagan and Zintel are searching for matches of device names and when the names match, a connection can be made, but if the names do not match, then a connection is not made.

The Applicants reply that this operation of searching for matches of device names is the opposite of comparing names to automatically resolve any name conflict, as claimed by the Applicants. The disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan and Zintel teach away from the Applicants' claimed invention.

**[3] Office Action Section 5, page 3, last paragraph:** Still further with respect to claim 1, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan and Zintel discloses the claimed storing

the user device address in association with the user-defined name in a user record, if there is no name conflict, the Examiner pointing to Flanagan, Fig. 4, item 93.

The Applicants reply that Flanagan describes this structure of Fig. 4 at column 7, lines 57 to column 8, line 4 as storing the names of other computers that the mobile device is partnered with. Storing the names of other computers is the opposite of storing the user device address, itself, in association with the user-defined name in a user record, as claimed. The disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan and Zintel teach away from the Applicants' claimed invention.

In summary, the Applicants reply that the combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan and Zintel does not disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the Applicants' claimed name distribution messages, which are distributed by the wireless devices in an ad hoc network. The name distribution messages include at least one user-defined name and an operation code that causes the receiving device in the ad hoc network to select an operation relating to a user-defined name that does not conflict with other member device names in the ad hoc network. A comparison is made to automatically resolve any name conflict and a user-defined name that does not conflict is automatically made a part of a user name record in the receiving device. The selected operation specified by the operation code can be, for example, to add a new device, delete a device, change the name of a device, substitute a new name manager table, specify security attributes for distributing the name, specify display attributes for displaying the name, or specify name flash display attributes for remotely flashing the displayed name. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan and Zintel fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature, among other features of the invention.

The disclosures selected by the Examiner in Zintel taken alone or in combination with Flanagan do not disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention in claim 1. Claim 1 is

allowable over this prior art. Claims 2 through 7, which were rejected over Flanagan and Zintel, depend on claim 1 and are allowable on the same basis as is claim 1.

**[4] Office Action Section 13, page 6, last paragraph:** Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan and Zintel does not disclose the claimed receiving the name distribution message from the user's device, which is located in a second ad hoc network, when connecting the second ad hoc network with the first said ad hoc network, but that the combination of Hild with Flanagan and Zintel makes this step obvious. The Examiner relies on the mentioning in Hild at col. 4, lines 30-67 and col. 6, lines 1-3 of a protocol resource manager triggering the sending of service information about the sending device and/or other known devices in an ad hoc network, wherein the device is able to leave a local network without formal notification.

The Applicants reply that Claim 8, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 1. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Hild merely discloses a device sending service advertisements to other devices in a wireless local network. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Hild fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as discussed above for claim 1. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[5] Office Action Section 14, page 7, second paragraph:** Regarding claims 9-12, which depend on claim 1 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild discloses the time stamp when a device entering the ad hoc wireless networking in the advertisement message at Hild's col. 13, lines 34-40.

The Applicants reply that Claims 9-12, which depend on claim 1 discussed above, are allowable on the same basis as is claim 1. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Hild

merely discloses that when a device receives an advertisement, the receiving device updates the timeouts for services in an internal list and eliminates expired entries. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Hild fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed substituting of the user-defined alternate name for the user-defined name in the user name record, if there is a name conflict and the user device time stamp is either younger or alternately older than a member device time stamp. Further, the disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Hild fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed substituting of the member-defined alternate name for the member-defined name in the member name record, if there is a name conflict and the member device time stamp is either younger or alternately older than a user device time stamp. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[6] Office Action Section 16, page 7, last paragraph:** Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild does not disclose the claimed hop count value and maximum hop count in the name distribution message; incrementing the current hop count value in the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network; and displaying the user-defined name in the plurality of member services if the current hop count value is not greater than the maximum hop count value, but that the combination of Ogier with Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild makes this feature obvious. The Examiner relies on page 1, paragraph 0008 and page 2, paragraph 0013 in Ogier, which describes that an update message may be sent to each child node if the number of children nodes is less than a predefined threshold.

The Applicants reply that Claim 13, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 1. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Ogier merely discloses limiting the dissemination of update information to nodes based on a predefined

threshold. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Ogier fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as discussed above for claim 1. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Ogier, Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[7] Office Action Section 17, page 8, last paragraph:** Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses associating the user device address with a user-defined permission to display, in the name distribution message; and granting to the plurality of member devices, permission to display the user-defined name, referring to Flanagan, Fig. 4, item 93.

The Applicants reply that Claim 14, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 1. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan describes this structure of Fig. 4 at column 7, lines 57 to column 8, line 4 as storing the names of other computers that the mobile device is partnered with. This is not a disclosure or suggestion of the Applicants' claimed invention of associating the user device address with a user-defined permission to display, in the name distribution message and granting to the at least one member device, permission to display the user-defined name. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Ogier, Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[8] Office Action Section 18, page 9, first paragraph:** Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses storing a member device address in a member name record stored in a plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network; receiving a name distribution message associating the member device address with a delete indication; distributing the name distribution message associating the member device address with the delete device indication, to

the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network; and deleting the member record from the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network, referring to Hild, col. 13, lines 34-40.

The Applicants reply that Claim 15, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 1. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Hild merely discloses that when a device receives an advertisement, the receiving device updates the timeouts for services in an internal list and eliminates expired entries. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as discussed above for claim 1. In claim 15, a delete device operation is selected in response to the operation code to delete the member record from the member devices in the ad hoc network. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Ogier, Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[9] Office Action Section 19, page 9, second paragraph:** Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses receiving a name distribution message associating the member device address with a change name indication; distributing the name distribution message associating the member device address with the change name indication, to the plurality of member devices in the as hoc network; and changing the member-defined name in the member record of the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network, referring to Flanagan, Fig. 6B, col. 12, lines 19-48.

The Applicants reply that Claim 16, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 1. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan requires the user to manually enter a name change. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as discussed above for claim 1. In claim 16, a change name operation is

selected in response to the operation code to change the member-defined name in the member record of at least one member device. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Ogier, Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[10] Office Action Section 20, page 9, last paragraph:** Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses associating a member device address with a member-defined name and a name display attribute; receiving a name distribution message associating the member device address with a change display attribute indication; distributing the name distribution message associating the member device address with a change display attribute indication, to the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network; and changing the name display attribute of the member-defined name in the member record of the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network, referring to Flanagan, Figs 4-6, col. 11, line 34 to col. 12, line 48.

The Applicants reply that Claim 17, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 1. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan discloses a mobile device searching for a desktop computer (Flanagan, col. 11, lines 39-42) by matching a unique identifier 15A specifying the name of the desktop computer and configuration settings to establish a connection between the mobile device and the desktop computer (see Flanagan, col. 3, line 40 to col. 4, line 11.) If the user has manually changed the mobile device name in Flanagan and then establishes a connection between the mobile device and the desktop computer, the desktop computer determines whether there is a name conflict and if there is a conflict, the desktop computer either terminates the connection or prompts the user to manually enter a different device name (Flanagan, col. 11, line 34 to col. 12, line 48.) The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as discussed above for claim 1. In claim



17, a change display attribute operation is selected in response to the operation code to change the name display attribute of the member-defined name in the member record of the plurality of member devices. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Ogier, Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[11] Office Action Section 21, page 10, first paragraph:** Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses associating a member device address with a member-defined name and a name display attribute, in a member name record stored in a plurality of member devices in an ad hoc network; receiving a name distribution message associating the member device address with a name flash display attribute indication; distributing the name distribution message associating the member device address with a name flash display attribute indication, to the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network; and flashing the display of the member-defined name in the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network, referring to Flanagan, Figs 4-6, col. 11, line 34 to col. 12, line 48.

The Applicants reply that Claim 18, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 1. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan is the same as is characterized in the preceding paragraph 10. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as discussed above for claim 1. In claim 18, a name flash display attribute operation is selected in response to the operation code to flash the display of the member-defined name in the plurality of member devices. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Ogier, Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[12] Office Action Section 22, page 10, second paragraph:** Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses associating a member device address with a security attribute, in a member name record stored in a plurality of member devices in an ad hoc network; receiving a name distribution message associating the member device address with a change security attribute indication; distributing the name distribution message associating the member device address with a change security attribute indication, to the member device; and changing the security attribute in the member record in the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network, referring to Flanagan, Figs 4-6, col. 11, line 34 to col. 12, line 48.

The Applicants reply that Claim 19, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 1. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan is the same as is characterized in the preceding paragraph 10. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as discussed above for claim 1. In claim 19, a change security attribute operation is selected in response to the operation code to change the security attribute in the member record in the plurality of member devices. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Ogier, Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[13] Office Action Section 23, page 10, last paragraph:** Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses associating a member device address with member-defined name and a security attribute, in a member name record stored in a plurality of member devices in an ad hoc network; receiving a name distribution message associating the member device address with an authorization list of member devices; distributing the name distribution message

associating the member device address with an authorization list of member devices, to the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network; and changing the security attribute of the member device, if it is listed on the authorization list, referring to Flanagan, Figs 4-6, col. 11, line 34 to col. 12, line 48.

The Applicants reply that Claim 20, which depends on claim 1 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 1. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan is the same as is characterized in the preceding paragraph 10. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as discussed above for claim 1. In claim 20, a change security attribute operation is selected in response to the operation code to change the security attribute of a member device, if it is listed on the authorization list. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Ogier, Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[14] Office Action Section 24, page 11, first paragraph:** With respect to independent claim 21, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses all limitations similar to those of claim 1, except for two limitations of distributing a name distribution message associating a user device address with a user-defined name and a user-defined alternate name, to the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network; and storing the user device address in association with the user-defined name in a user name record in the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network, if there is no name conflict. The Examiner states that Flanagan discloses in Fig. 4 that the user can change device name of the mobile 3A or 3B and to the new name and list of partnership is modified and stored in the memory in the mobile, referring to Flanagan, Fig 4, 6A-B, col. 11, line 34 to col. 12, line 59.

The Applicants reply that claim 21 is patentable on the same basis as is claim 1, as discussed above. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Flanagin fails to disclose a name distribution message associating a user device address with a user-defined name and a user-defined alternate name. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Flanagin discloses a mobile device searching for a desktop computer (Flanagin, col. 11, lines 39-42) by matching a unique identifier 15A specifying the name of the desktop computer and configuration settings to establish a connection between the mobile device and the desktop computer (see Flanagin, col. 3, line 40 to col. 4, line 11.) If the user has manually changed the mobile device name in Flanagin and then establishes a connection between the mobile device and the desktop computer, the desktop computer determines whether there is a name conflict and if there is a conflict, the desktop computer either terminates the connection or prompts the user to manually enter a different device name (Flanagin, col. 11, line 34 to col. 12, line 48.) The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagin, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed name distribution messages, which are distributed by the wireless devices in an ad hoc network. The name distribution messages include a user-defined name, a user-defined alternate name and an operation code that causes the receiving device in the ad hoc network to select an operation relating to either the user-defined name or the user-defined alternate name that does not conflict with other member device names in the ad hoc network. A comparison is made to automatically resolve any name conflict and the user-defined name or the user-defined alternate name that does not conflict is automatically made a part of a user name record in the receiving device. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Ogier, Flanagin, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[15] Office Action Section 25, page 11, second last paragraph:** Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, the Examiner states that the claim is rejected on the same basis as in claim 21.

The Applicants reply that Claim 22, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 21.

**[16] Office Action Section 26, page 11, last paragraph:** Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses associating the member device address with the member-defined name and an annunciator attribute, in the member name record stored in the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network; receiving a name distribution message associating the member device address with a change display attribute indication; distributing the name distribution message associating the member device address with a change display attribute indication, to the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network; and changing the annunciator attribute of the member-defined name in the member record of the plurality of member devices in the ad hoc network, referring to Zintel, Fig. 14, page 15, paragraph [0241]-[0258]; Figs 18-20; page 19, paragraph [0307].

The Applicants reply that Claim 23, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 21. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Zintel discloses in FIG. 14 a browsing protocol sequence for one device to search for other devices and discover the services they have available by issuing an HTTP GET command and receiving a description document. This requires matching the device names (see Zintel's paragraphs [0159] and [0198].) Zintel's disclosed discovery operation of searching for other devices' services, which requires matching the device names, is the opposite of comparing device names to automatically resolve any name conflict, as claimed by the Applicants. The disclosure referred

to by the Examiner in Zintel discloses in FIGS. 18, 19, and 20 a specification used to query state Variables, invoke Commands and carry notifications or events. It specifies the type of protocol used, the network endpoint to which messages are sent, the contents of those messages, the contents of the expected responses and the contents of events. This is part of Zintel's disclosed discovery operation of searching for other devices' services, which requires matching the device names. In particular, Zintel's paragraph [0342] provides that if no event source matches the Request-URI from the subscription message, the HTTP server should return "404 Not Found". This is the opposite of comparing device names to automatically resolve any name conflict, as claimed by the Applicants. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[17] Office Action Section 27, page 12, first paragraph:** Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses, wherein said annunciator attribute controls the font of the member-defined name as it is displayed, referring to Zintel, Figs. 15-16, page 15-17, paragraphs [0259]-[0266]; Figs 18-20.

The Applicants reply that Claim 24, which depends on claims 21 and 23 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 21. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Zintel merely discloses a document description layout, but does not disclose the claimed features discussed above for claim 21.

**[18] Office Action Section 28, page 12:** Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses, wherein said annunciator attribute controls the color of the member-defined name as it is displayed, referring to Zintel, Figs. 15-16, page 15-17, paragraphs [0259]-[0266]; Figs 18-20.

The Applicants reply that Claim 25, which depends on claims 21 and 23 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 21. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Zintel merely discloses a document description layout, but does not disclose the claimed features discussed above for claim 21.

**[19] Office Action Section 29, page 12:** Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses, wherein said annunciator attribute controls the animation of the member-defined name as it is displayed, referring to Zintel, Figs. 15-16, page 15-17, paragraphs [0259]-[0266]; Figs 18-20.

The Applicants reply that Claim 26, which depends on claims 21 and 23 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 21. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Zintel merely discloses a document description layout, but does not disclose the claimed features discussed above for claim 21.

**[20] Office Action Section 30, page 12:** Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses, wherein said annunciator attribute controls a sound played in conjunction with the display of the member-defined name, referring to Zintel, Figs. 15-16, page 15-17, paragraphs [0259]-[0266]; Figs 18-20.

The Applicants reply that Claim 27, which depends on claims 21 and 23 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 21. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Zintel merely discloses a document description layout, but does not disclose the claimed features discussed above for claim 21.

**[21] Office Action Section 31, page 12:** Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, the Examiner states that the claim is rejected on the same basis as in claim 1.

The Applicants reply that Claim 28, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 21.

**[22] Office Action Section 32, page 12:** Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, the Examiner states that the claim is rejected on the same basis as in claim 1.

The Applicants reply that Claim 29, which depends on claim 21 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 21.

**[23] Office Action Section (unnumbered), page 13, first paragraph:** Regarding independent claim 30, the Examiner states that the claim has all of the limitations of claim 1 except the limitation of “connecting a second ad hoc network containing a user device, to the first ad hoc network,” referring to Hild, col. 4, lines 30-61.

The Applicants reply that claim 30 is patentable on the same basis as is claim 1, as discussed above. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Hild merely discloses a device sending service advertisements to other devices in a wireless local network. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Hild fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants’ claimed invention as discussed above for claim 1. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan, Zintel, and Hild fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

**[24] Office Action Section 33, page 13:** Regarding claims 31-36, which depend on claim 30 discussed above, the Examiner states that the claim is rejected on the same basis as in claims 9-14.

The Applicants reply that claims 31-36, which depend on claim 30 discussed above, are allowable on the same basis as is claim 30. Moreover, claims 31-36 are allowable on the same basis as are claims 9-14, discussed above.

**[25] Office Action Section 34, page 13:** Regarding claim 37, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier



discloses wherein the wireless devices use a IEEE 802.11 Wireless LAN standard, referring to Hild, col. 3, lines 1-67.)

The Applicants reply that claim 37, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 30.

**[26] Office Action Section 35, page 13:** Regarding claim 38, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses wherein the wireless devices use the High Performance Radio Local Area Network (HIPERLAN) standard, referring to Hild, col. 3, lines 1-67.)

The Applicants reply that claim 38, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 30.

**[27] Office Action Section 36, page 13:** Regarding claim 39, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses wherein the wireless devices use the Bluetooth standard, referring to Hild, col. 3, lines 1-67.)

The Applicants reply that claim 39, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 30.

**[28] Office Action Section 37, page 13:** Regarding claim 40, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses wherein the wireless devices use the Digital Enhanced Cordless Telecommunications (DECT) standard, referring to Hild, col. 3, lines 1-67.)

The Applicants reply that claim 40, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 30.

**[29] Office Action Section 38, page 13:** Regarding claim 41, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier

discloses wherein the wireless devices use the Shared Wireless Access Protocol (SWAP) standard, referring to Hild, col. 3, lines 1-67.)

The Applicants reply that claim 41, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 30.

**[30] Office Action Section 39, page 13:** Regarding claim 42, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses wherein the wireless devices use the IEEE 802.15 Wireless Personal Area Network (WPAN) standard, referring to Hild, col. 3, lines 1-67.)

The Applicants reply that claim 42, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 30.

**[31] Office Action Section 40, page 14:** Regarding claim 43, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses wherein the wireless devices use the Infrared Data Association (IrDA) standard, referring to Hild, col. 3, lines 1-67.)

The Applicants reply that claim 43, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 30.

**[32] Office Action Section 41, page 14:** Regarding claim 44, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, the Examiner states that the combination of Flanagan, Zintel, Hild, and Ogier discloses wherein the wireless devices use the Multimedia Mobile Access Communication (MMAC) Systems standard, referring to Hild, col. 3, lines 1-67.)

The Applicants reply that claim 44, which depends on claim 30 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 30.

**[33] Office Action Section (42), page 14:** Regarding independent claim 45, the Examiner states that the claim is a system claim corresponding to claim 1; therefore it is rejected

under the same rationale as claim 1.

The Applicants reply that claim 45 is patentable on the same basis as is claim 1, as discussed above. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in rejecting claim 1 over Flanagin and Zintel fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention in claim 45, as discussed above for claim 1.

**[34] Office Action Section (43), page 14:** Regarding claim 46, which depends on claim 45, the Examiner states that the claim has similar limitations of claim 1; therefore it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

The Applicants reply that claim 46, which depends on claim 45 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 45. Moreover, claim 46 is patentable on the same basis as is claim 1, as discussed above.

**[35] Office Action Section (44), page 14:** Regarding independent claim 47, the Examiner states that the claim is a computer readable medium claim corresponding to claim 1; therefore it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

The Applicants reply that claim 47 is patentable on the same basis as is claim 1, as discussed above. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in rejecting claim 1 over Flanagin and Zintel fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention in claim 47, as discussed above for claim 1.

**[36] Office Action Section (45), page 14:** Regarding claim 48, which depends on claim 47, the Examiner states that the claim has similar limitations of claim 46; therefore it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 46.

The Applicants reply that claim 48, which depends on claim 47 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 47.

**[37] Office Action Section (46), page 14:** Regarding independent claim 49, the Examiner states that the claim has all of the limitations of claim 1 except the limitation of "appending the new name table to the existing name table to form a composite name table," referring to Flanagan, Fig. 4, the Examiner further stating that the mobile has the appending list 93 in its memory 90.

The Applicants reply that claim 49 is patentable on the same basis as is claim 1, as discussed above. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan is discussed at Flanagan col. 7, lines 57 to col. 8, line 4, which merely discloses the mobile device 3A storing a "Device Name" at 93 given by the user, as well as names at 95 and 99 of one or more desktop computers 4 with which the mobile device 3A has been partnered. The combination of disclosures referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan and Zintel fails to disclose or suggest the claimed feature of appending the new name table to the existing name table to form a composite name table. The disclosure referred to by the Examiner in Flanagan and Zintel fails to disclose or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as discussed above for claim 1.

**[38] Office Action Section (47), page 14:** Regarding claim 50, which depends on claim 49, the Examiner states that the claim has similar limitations of claim 1; therefore it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

The Applicants reply that claim 50, which depends on claim 49 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 49. Moreover, claim 50 is patentable on the same basis as is claim 1, as discussed above.

**[39] Office Action Section (48), page 14:** Regarding independent claim 51, the Examiner states that the claim has similar limitations of claim 49; therefore it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 49.

The Applicants reply that claim 51 is allowable on the same basis as is claim 49.

Moreover, claim 51 is patentable on the same basis as is claim 1, as discussed above.

**[40] Office Action Section (49), page 14:** Regarding claim 52, which depends on claim 51, the Examiner states that the claim has similar limitations of claim 50; therefore it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 50.

The Applicants reply that claim 52, which depends on claim 51 discussed above, is allowable on the same basis as is claim 51. Moreover, claim 52 is patentable on the same basis as is claim 1, as discussed above.

Please consider the new claims 53 to 65 added by this amendment.

By the above amendment and remarks, the Applicants believe they have addressed and resolved all of the ground for rejection raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the claims now in the case, allow all claims, and pass the case to issue.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4004. A DUPLICATE COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: June 17, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_

John E. Hoel

Registration No. 26,279

(202) 857-7887 Telephone

(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

**Correspondence Address:**

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101